

**HESPERITES POMPECKJ, 1895 (CEPHALOPODA, AMMONOIDEA):  
PROPOSED SUPPRESSION UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS.  
Z.N.(S.) 1873**

By D. T. Donovan (*Department of Geology, University College, London*)

The generic name *Hesperites* was proposed by Pompeckj (1895, p. 24) with the type-species *Hesperites clarae* Pompeckj (1895, p. 24, pl. 2, figs. 1a-g, text-fig. 4) by monotypy.

2. The genus was named in a paper which reviewed the whole of the known ammonoid fauna of the Rhaetian Stage of the Triassic System. It was founded on a single specimen which had been found loose on the outcrop of the Kössener Schichten (Pompeckj, 1895, p. 27). Although the specimen showed resemblance to the Jurassic ammonite genus *Schlotheimia* Bayle, 1878, the possibility that it had fallen from a Jurassic outcrop at a higher level was rejected by Pompeckj (op. cit. p. 27). Relationship with *Schlotheimia* was also rejected by Pompeckj on account of alleged difference of the suspensive lobe of the septal suture (Pompeckj op. cit. p. 29).

3. I have been unable to find any work in the primary palaeontological literature in which the genus *Hesperites* has been used by an author describing or revising the Triassic ammonoid fauna. Citations known to me are given in the following paragraphs.

4. The genus was listed without comment in Diener's *Cephalopoda triadica* (1915), a section of the Fossilium Catalogus which purports to record all genera and species of Triassic ammonoids named up to the date of compilation. No additional species of *Hesperites* were noted in part 2 of the same work (Kutassy, 1932). It was not included in the appropriate volume of the *Treatise on Invertebrate Paleontology* (Arkell et al., 1957), which purports to record all valid taxa down to generic level. It was not included in the Russian *Osnovy Paleontologii* (Luppov & Druschitz, 1958).

5. Roman (1938, p. 59) in a survey of Jurassic and Cretaceous ammonoid genera accepted *Hesperites* as a Triassic ancestor of the Jurassic *Schlotheimia*. Lange (1951, p. 18) in a monographic treatment of north German *Schlotheimiinae* discussed and rejected this view. He agreed with Pompeckj (see 2, above) that *Hesperites* was unlikely to be an ancestor of *Schlotheimia*. He pointed out that its closest resemblance was to a younger *schlotheimiinae*, *Charnasseiceras*, but thought that there was no reason to reject the well-established descent of *Charnasseiceras* from *Schlotheimia*. Lange, therefore, did not disagree with Pompeckj's view that *Hesperites* was unrelated to known Triassic or Jurassic genera, and he regarded the resemblance between *Hesperites* and *Charnasseiceras* as being due to convergence.

6. Other references to the genus attach doubt to its horizon or interpretation. Spath in a systematic catalogue of Triassic ammonoids in the British Museum (1951, p. 8) did not accept it as a Triassic genus and implied that he thought it to be a Jurassic schlotheimiine. Trümpy (in Slavin, 1963) and Silberling and Tozer (1968, p. 17) took the same view. Howarth, in a list of genera omitted from the *Treatise on Invertebrate Paleontology* (1960, p. 197), categorized it as "not recognizable".

7. It is possible, as implied by Spath (1951), that the type of *Hesperites clarae* is really a Jurassic schlotheimiinae, such as *Charmasseiceras* Spath, 1924, or *Sulciferites* Spath, 1922, despite Pompeckj's assertion to the contrary. Lange's objections to this relationship fall if one considers that the specimen may be of Jurassic age, a possibility which Lange apparently did not consider. This cannot be proved, but an author who believed it to be the case would be obliged to use the little-used and unfamiliar name *Hesperites* in place of one of the better-known generic names in the subfamily Schlotheimiinae such as *Sulciferites* (1922) or *Charmasseiceras* (1924).

8. It appears from 4, above, that the name *Hesperites* has not been used by workers on the Trias as a name for an accepted Triassic ammonoid during the last 50 years.

9. In view of the considerations mentioned above I apply for:

(1) the use of the plenary powers to suppress the following names for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy:

(a) the generic name *Hesperites* Pompeckj, 1895;

(b) the specific name *clarae* Pompeckj, 1895, as published in the binomen *Hesperites clarae*;

(2) the addition of the generic name suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above to the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology;

(3) the addition of the specific name suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) (b) above to the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology.

#### REFERENCES

- ARKELL, W. J., et al. 1957. *Cephalopoda, Ammonoidea, Treatise on Invertebrate Paleontology* (Moore, R. C., ed.) *L. Mollusca* 4 : xxii, L490, Kansas, Geol. Soc. Amer. and Univ. Kansas Press
- DIENER, C. 1915. *Cephalopoda triadica, Fossilium Catalogus*, (Frech, F., ed.) *I. Animalia*, 8 : 1-369. Berlin, Junk
- HOWARTH, M. K. 1960. Generic Names for Ammonoidea Published during the Period 1758-1954. *J. Paleont.*, 34 : 194-200
- KUTASSY, A. 1932. *Cephalopoda triadica II, Fossilium Catalogus*, (Quenstedt, W., ed.) *I. Animalia*, 56 : 371-832. Berlin, Junk
- LANGE, W. 1951. Die Schlotheimiinae aus dem Lias alpha Norddeutschlands. *Palaeontographica*, 100A : 1-128, pls. 1-20

- LUPPOV, N. P., and DRUSCHITZ, V. V., 1958. *Mollyuski galvanogie, II Ammonoidei, Osnovy Paleontologii*, (Orlov, Y. A., ed.), 6 : 359, 78 pls.
- POMPECKJ, J. F. 1895. Ammoniten des Rhät, *Neues Jb. Miner. Palaönt., Abh.* 2 : 1-46, pls. 1-2
- ROMAN, F. 1938. *Les Ammonites Jurassiques et Crétacés* : 554, 53 pls. Paris. Masson
- SILBERLING, N. J., and TOZER, E. T. 1968. Biostratigraphic Classification of the Marine Triassic in North America, *Spec. Pap. geol. Soc. Am.*, 110 : 63, 1 pl.
- SLAVIN, V. I. 1963. Au Sujet du Rhétien, *Bur. Recherches Géol. et Minières Mém.*, 15 : 29-32
- SPATH, L. F. 1951. *The Ammonoidea of the Trias (II)*, *Catalogue of the Fossil Cephalopoda in the British Museum (Natural History)* 5 : vi, 228. London.